DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 886 JC 690 084

By-Capper, Michael R.; Gaddy, Dale

Faculty Participation in Junior College Governance.

American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.

Pub Date Feb 69

Note-4p.

Journal Cit-Junior College Research Review; v3 n6 Feb 1969

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.30

Descriptors-Administrative Problems, *College Administration, *Faculty Organizations, *Governance, *Junior Colleges, *Policy Formation

The current conflict between faculty and administration will continue to grow and must receive attention from the junior college. Some conflict is natural and neither could nor should be eliminated. Increased faculty involvement in institutional governance will keep undesirable conflict at a minimum and will encourage constructive debate. The usual way for faculty to participate in college governance is through a faculty senate, with established channels of policy formation and implementation. Without such an organization, the college can expect increasing pressure from external faculty organizations whose interests may or may not fit the goals and philosophy of the institution. (HH)

ED 027 088

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER

ERIC

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INFORMATION

Volume 3, Number 6

UCLA JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW

February 1969

Published by the American Association of Junior Colleges

FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN JUNIOR COLLEGE GOVERNANCE

Faculty participation in institutional governance is one of the most controversial issues facing the contemporary community junior college. According to the American Association of Higher Education Task Force on Faculty Representation and Academic Negotiations, the future pattern of governance in institutions of higher education depends on the manner in which administrators deal with faculty aspirations (ED 018 218).

One author, finding it inconceivable that faculty members should not have a part in the governance of the institution, proclaims that the college should (1) define the roles of its governing board, administration, and faculty; (2) delegate decisions concerning educational policy to the faculty; and (3) open channels of communication through which the faculty can express opinions on matters other than educational policy. Only then will an institution reflect high morale and solid academic achievement (ED 014 268).

This issue of *Junior College Research Review* examines several possible resolutions of the controversy and conflict over faculty participation in junior college governance. Documents herein reviewed were selected from materials received and processed at the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information. All of the reviewed materials have been announced and abstracted in the official ERIC publication, *Research in Education.*

JC 690 084

Review

Democratic operation, according to one writer, is justifiable on purely pragmatic bases, since it harnesses the maximum amount of talent and wisdom, reduces frustration, dissension, and discord, maximizes identification, and creates an atmosphere conducive to effective instruction. Since the degree of operational democracy in a junior college depends on the kind of organizational structure that is established, the adoption of democratic mechanics at the inception of the college limits the possibilities for undemocratic behavior by either autocratic administrators or tyrannical faculty cliques. The ideal democratic system, he feels, is a committee system, where both faculty and administration share all the decision-making processes of the institution (ED 012 172).

The AAHE Task Force also recommends a system of "shared authority" between faculty and administration involving a wide variety of issues. The use of neutral third parties, the application of sanctions, and information-sharing and appeals to reason are three approaches to faculty-administration decision-making, with the greatest reliance placed on the latter. The faculty can be represented by an internal organization such as the academic senate, an external organization such as the American Association of University Professors, or a bargaining agency such as the American Federation of Teachers. The concept of "shared authority" is best implemented by an internal organization. External organizations can coexist with and complement internal organizations, offering information and technical services, and support of sanctions if necessary, but bargaining agencies usually will not develop unless the administration fails to support an effective internal organization. The most effective internal organization, according to the Task Force, is an academic senate that includes faculty and administrators, with the faculty in a clear majority (ED 018 218).

The president of the California Junior College Faculty Association reflects a similar viewpoint. He writes, ". . . to eliminate the divisive effect of internal conflict, the faculty must be represented by a single body [e.g., an academic senate] that is open to the ideas of all representative faculty groups." He further asserts

that the external professional education groups will continue to play an important role in the relationships between faculty as a particular group and faculties in general at the state and national level. His answer to the question of who should speak for junior college professors is twofold: (1) the academic senate at the campus level; and (2) the professional educational organization at the state and national level (ED 017 250).

The 1967 Arizona Junior College Administrative Conference, dealing with the problems of governance, concluded that the governing board, the administration, the faculty, and the students must be involved in this process. The Association underscored the need to cultivate mutual respect between faculty and administration. Power, according to the Association, is now a faculty tool rather than solely a tool of the board and administration (ED 019 930).

In 1967 the AAJC noted that the junior college, evolving out of a publicly controlled secondary school system, does not have the traditional basis for faculty participation in governance that the university has, and that the tremendous expansion by the junior college hinders involvement of the faculty in the decision-making process. Even with this knowledge, however, the AAJC sees as illogical the governance of the junior college as if it were an elementary or secondary school. Members of the junior college faculty are professional people, the report states, and as such will expect to be treated as professionals. The degree to which members of the faculty are treated as "mere employees" will determine how militant and how organized they become (ED 012 177).

Some conflict apparently is unavoidable. Epler, studying the nature of conflict as it applies to junior college governance, listed the following as causes of administrative-faculty conflict: stereotyping, differing goals, differing role expectations, lack of data, separate perspectives, inadequate communication, and poor administration. His conclusion is that there are two types of conflict: natural and aggravated. That a faculty often has different goals from the administration is natural, but poor administrative practices, ambiguous goals, lack of data, and insufficient faculty communication only serve to aggravate conflict. Thus, while natural conflict will continue to exist, adept administrators and fair-minded faculty members can reduce aggravated conflict (ED 014 951)

The most frequently mentioned "solution" to the natural conflict between administrators and faculty members is the involvement of the faculty senate in institutional policy-making (ED 018 218, ED 019 930, ED 011 449, ED 013 640, ED 017 250). The California Junior College Association's Committee of Institutional Research has identified the need to define the role of the academic senate as a critical need (ED 011 449). Accordingly, the committee maintains that any definition of the academic senate should include the following:

1. Determination of the role of the academic senate at the policy-making level.
2. Defining the relationship of the academic senate to the administrative staff and board of trustees.
3. Evaluation of the capabilities of the teaching faculty to devote sufficient time to participation in administrative functioning.
4. Defining the relationship between academic freedom and the functions of an academic senate.
5. Determination of the role of the academic senate in a district having multiple colleges.
6. Developing guidelines for cooperation between the instructional and administrative staffs through the effective functioning of the academic senate.
7. Investigation of who speaks for the faculty.

In 1967, San Joaquin Delta College conducted a survey of 78 California junior colleges in an attempt to assess how their faculty senates were involved in institutional governance. An 84 percent response from either the president or vice-president of these institutions revealed that (1) each responding institution had a faculty senate, and approximately half of these made recommendations on all campus matters; (2) most of the senate recommenda-

tions were in the areas affecting their personal lives and working conditions, and secondarily in the areas of instructional improvement, academic freedom, and controversial policy issues; and (3) nearly half of the presidents felt that the role of the academic senate should be policy-advisement and recommendation in areas where the faculty had the capabilities to serve effectively (ED 013 640).

Summary

The conflict that currently exists between faculty members and administrators is an important dynamic that must be attended to by the contemporary community junior college. As one writer has suggested, some conflict is natural and, thus, could not and should not be eliminated. It is clear, however, that increased faculty involvement in institutional governance is necessary to keep unnatural conflict at a minimum, and to encourage constructive resolution of natural conflict.

The most commonly suggested method for including faculty in the governance of their institutions is the creation of a faculty senate wherein faculty members have a recognized means of participation in policy-formation and policy-implementation. In the absence of such an organization, the junior college can expect increasing pressure from external faculty organizations whose interests may or may not be consistent with the goals and philosophy of the institution.

Michael R. Capper
and
Dale Gaddy

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ED 011 449

Critical Problems and Needs of California's Junior Colleges, by Basil H. Peterson, California Junior College Association, Modesto, Calif., 1965.

ED 014 268

The Role of Faculty in Community College Policy Making, by Norma E. Bentley, Cazenovia College, Cazenovia, N.Y., 1966.

ED 012 172

Structure as a Determinant of Democratic Administration, by Charles C. Collins, Grossmont College, El Cajon, Calif., 1963.

ED 012 177

Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems; a Preliminary National Appraisal, by Roger H. Garrison, American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1967.

ED 014 951

Faculty-Administration Relationships—Why the Conflict? (Seminar Paper), by Stephen M. Epler, University of California, School of Education, Los Angeles, Calif., 1966.

ED 013 640

Relationships of Faculty Senates (Councils) to the Administrative Staff, Presidents and/or Superintendents, and Boards of Trustees in Sixty-Eight California Junior Colleges as Reported by the Presidents or Vice Presidents, by Marion K. Bandley, San Joaquin Delta College, Stockton, Calif., 1967.

ED 017 250

Faculty Governance in Turmoil—Who Speaks for the Junior College Professor? by Louis C. Riess, California Junior College Faculty Association, Long Beach, Calif., 1967.

ED 018 218

Faculty Participation in Academic Governance, by Stephen J. Wright, American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C., 1967.

ED 019 930

Report of the Junior College Administrative Conference (Arizona State University, December 6-7, 1967), by H. K. Newburn, Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz., 1967.

Abstracts of documents processed in the ERIC system may be found in *Research in Education*, a publication of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. *Research in Education* may be ordered from the Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402.
(Single copy, $1.75; annual subscription of 12 issues, $21.00).

All of the documents reviewed are available (in microfiche or hard copy) from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

Research in Education is cumulated annually and semi-annually: RIE Semi-Annual Index, January—June, 1968. This index, used in conjunction with the 1967 RIE Annual Indexes, offers the most complete and comprehensive search tool for retrieving reports that have been announced in *Research in Education* since the first issue was published in November 1966.

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE INFORMATION

Arthur M. Cohen, *Principal Investigator and Director*

Lorraine Mathies, *Co-Investigator*

Advisory Board

LOUIS W. BENDER
Chairman, Council of State Directors
of Community Junior Colleges

EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR.
Executive Director
American Association of Junior Colleges

C. WAYNE GORDON
Associate Dean
Graduate School of Education, UCLA

ROBERT M. HAYES
Professor, School of Library Service, UCLA
Director, Institute of Library Research

B. LAMAR JOHNSON
Professor of Higher Education, UCLA

JOHN LOMBARDI
Assistant Superintendent, Junior Colleges
Los Angeles City Schools

LLOYD MESSERSMITH
Executive Secretary
California Junior College Association

JOHN E. ROUECHE
Regional Education Laboratory for
the Carolinas and Virginia

ROBERT VOSPER
University Librarian, UCLA

JAMES L. WATTENBARGER
Director, Institute of Higher Education
University of Florida

The Clearinghouse operates under contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.

JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW
Arthur M. Cohen, Editor
Clearinghouse for Junior College Information
Room 96, Powell Library
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

American Association of Junior Colleges
1315 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
LOS ANGELES, CALIF.
PERMIT NO. 12378